





Effectiveness of Short-Term Dynamic Therapy Based on Mentalization on the Reflective Capacity of Mothers and Internalizing and Externalizing Problems in Children


Tanya. Darabi¹, Naser. Amini^{2*}, Mouloud. Keykhosrovani¹ [Error! Reference source not found.](#)

¹ Ph.D student, Department of Psychology, Bushehr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran



² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Bushehr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: amini_n2010@yahoo.com

Editor

Parisa Nilforooshan¹
Professor of Psychology Associate
Professor, Counseling Department,
Faculty of Educational Sciences and
Psychology, Isfahan University,
Isfahan
p.nilforooshan@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei¹
Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities
Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Nadereh Saadati¹
Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University,
California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction lacks a clear statement of the research problem. Specify the problem statement early to anchor the reader's understanding.

The research questions are somewhat vague. Each question should be refined to be more specific, measurable, and directly tied to the research objectives.

Increase the detail in the methodology section. Describe the selection criteria for your dataset and the rationale behind the chosen analytical techniques.

Add a subsection discussing any ethical considerations related to your study, especially if human or sensitive data is involved.

Clarify the data collection process. Specify how data integrity was ensured during collection and processing.

Standardize the citation format throughout the document. Some references are not in the appropriate academic style.

The discussion section lacks a thorough analysis of the limitations of the study. Expand this to include potential biases and constraints.

Include a comparative analysis with existing solutions or theories. This comparison can highlight the contributions of your work more effectively.

The conclusions drawn are not succinctly tied back to the research questions. Revise this to clearly link outcomes to objectives.

If applicable, discuss the use of cross-validation in your model testing to enhance the reliability of your results.

The paper lacks a thorough comparison with peer work. Integrate more direct comparisons to similar studies, discussing similarities and differences.

Expand on the practical implications of your findings. How can they be applied in real-world scenarios?

The overall writing style can be more formal and academic. Avoid colloquialisms and ensure a professional tone throughout.

Strengthen the conclusion to more forcefully state the importance and impact of your findings within the field.

There are several grammatical and syntactical errors throughout the document. A thorough proofreading session is recommended.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The abstract should succinctly summarize the key points of your paper. Currently, it contains unnecessary details.

Re-evaluate the chosen keywords. Ensure they are highly relevant and specific to your field and study.

Clarify technical jargon and acronyms upon first use to ensure accessibility for readers not specialized in a niche area.

Clearly state if the hypotheses were supported or refuted by the results, providing a direct answer to each research question.

Describe the experimental setup in more detail, including any controls used, to allow for reproducibility.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.